

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the present application. In this amendment, Applicants have amended claim 1 and canceled claims 10-14 and 19-23. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 10-14, and 19-23 prior to this Amendment, is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claim 1 was amended and claims 10-14 and 19-23 were canceled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 10-14, and 19-23 as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Claims 10-14 have been canceled; therefore, this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Helgeson et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,072,934 (hereinafter “*Helgeson*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, in part: “using an external configuration file to determine whether a particular verb that is included in the automation message is a valid verb, wherein said configuration file includes a plurality of verbs and an association of each one of said plurality of verbs to one of said automation tools, and wherein said particular verb is valid if said particular verb is included in said configuration file”. *Helgeson* does not anticipate Applicants’ claims because *Helgeson* does not teach these features.

Helgeson, in column 99, teaches a sample purchase order XSL stylesheet that includes a verb, but does not teach determining whether this verb is a valid verb by determining if it is included in a configuration file. *Helgeson*, in column 103, also teaches an equivalent Interchange Format document generated by the stylesheet transformation that includes a verb. Again, however, teaching a verb in an Interchange Format document does not teach determining whether this verb is a valid verb by determining if it is included in a configuration file.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, in part:

determining whether an idle execution thread is available from a thread pool that is assigned to one of a plurality of verb groups to which the particular verb belongs, and wherein each one of said plurality of verbs belongs to one of said plurality of verb

groups, and further wherein said configuration file defines a maximum number of concurrent threads that are available to each one of the plurality of verb groups;

responsive to determining that said idle execution thread is available, executing said verb dispatcher on said idle execution thread;

responsive to determining that said idle execution thread is not available, determining whether said maximum number of concurrent threads available to said one of said plurality of verb groups has been reached;

responsive to determining that said maximum number of concurrent threads available to said one of said plurality of verb groups has not been reached, creating a new thread and executing said verb dispatcher on said new thread;

Helgeson does not teach these features.

In column 2, lines 26-49, *Helgeson* refers to a prior art multi-threaded system. Further regarding “threads”, *Helgeson* teaches:

Once connected, messages may be sent or received from the DeliveryService. There are two ways messages can be delivered depending upon how the recipient registers. The recipient may Poll for messages using IPostman.getMessage() or handle incoming messages by implementing IRecipient.receiveMessage(). The IPostman.connect() method has an optional IRecipient parameter. If a valid IRecipient is passed, incoming messages will be delivered using that interface. In this case, behind the scenes, an InboxAssistant is created in a separate thread to watch the Inbox on behalf of the recipient. When a message is sent using IPostman.sendMessage() the DeliveryService is responsible for making sure that the message gets delivered to the appropriate Inbox. If it cannot it must report or log an error.

Helgeson, column 113, lines 39-53.

Thus, *Helgeson* teaches an InboxAssistant that is created in a thread to watch the Inbox.

Helgeson also teaches:

So far the discussion has been around the Interconnect/Connector framework. The following discusses Connector Specific plug ins, and defines the specific components for each connector. Taking Saba Connector as an example: a. SabaChangeManager--This class extends the Change Manager, starts a thread that polls the database for changes. Once a change is detected the change is passed over to the Monitor for further processing. This class has the specific logic to poll Saba database. b. SabaImporterWriter--This class extends the ImporterWriter and has the logic to import Objects in Local format (SCF) into Saba system. c. SabaAccessorReader--This class extends the AccessorReader and has the specific logic to retrieve objects from Saba system in local format.

Helgeson, column 116, lines 41-55.

This section of *Helgeson* teaches starting a thread that polls the database for changes.

Other than the reference of a prior art multi-threaded system, these two paragraphs contain the only references to a “thread” that Applicants could locate. *Helgeson* provides no teaching about idle threads, thread pools, maximum concurrent threads, thread pools that are assigned to verb groups, the recited steps, or the interrelationships of the features recited by Applicants. Therefore, *Helgeson* does not anticipate Applicants’ claims.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-3, 11-12, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Helgeson* in view of Belfiore et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,990,513 (hereinafter “*Belfiore*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 11-12 and 20-21 were canceled.

The combination of *Helgeson* and *Belfiore* does not render Applicants’ claims obvious because *Belfiore* does not cure the deficiencies of *Helgeson* discussed above. Therefore, the rejection of claims 2-3, 11-12, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: August 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa L.B. Yociss/

Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants